Remarks

The Office Action rejected claims 1-6, 8-12 and 19-22, objected to claims 7 and 13, and allowed claims 14-18 and 23-29. Applicant has amended claims 8 and 10-12. Claims 1-29 remain pending.

Allowed and Allowable Claims

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's allowance of the claims 14-18 and 23-29 and the Examiner's indication that claims 7 and 13 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant, however, has elected not to rewrite claims 7 and 13 in independent form as the base claims from which they depend are believed to be allowable. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 7 and 13 in light of the points that follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The Office Action rejected claims 1-6. 8-12 and 19-22, under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Peek (US patent No. 5,644,784). Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of claims 1-6. 8-12 and 19-22 be withdrawn.

Claims 1-4 and 19-22

Claims 1-4 and 19-22 require determining an address for a burst write of a command and arguments of the command based upon an argument count of the command and writing the arguments and the command starting from the determined

address. The Office Action appears to rely upon figure 4 and the related description of the Peek's document. Peek teaches that DMA controller 400 has its descriptor pointer 408 pointing to address 70025. The DMA controller 400 will therefore fetch that location and the valid bit will be set to true in the address 70025. The length count in address 70025 is then inserted into length register 410 of DMA controller 400. The DMA controller then decrements its descriptor pointer 408 to address 70024 and fetches source pointer 414. Next, DMA controller decrements its descriptor pointer 408 to 70023 and fetches destination pointer 412. The DMA controller decrements its descriptor pointer 408 to 70022 so that it will be prepared for the next set of descriptor fetches. The DMA controller then proceeds to execute the DMA transfer as specified in its length counter 410, destination pointer 412, and source pointer 414. When this DMA transfer has completed DMA controller 400 begins to fetch the next descriptor beginning at the location in its descriptor pointer, address 70022. Where as according to the Applicant's invention an address for burst write is first determined based upon the argument count of the commend and then in response to performing the burst write, arguments and command starting from the determined address are written.

Further, Applicant submits that the Office Action appears to equate descriptor pointer 408 pointing to address 70025 with the determining an address for a burst. If at all it is presumed that descriptor pointer is meant to determine the address, even then Peek fails to teach that the determination of address by the descriptor pointer is based upon an argument count of the command and in response to performing the burst write, writing the arguments and the command starting from the determined address.

Accordingly, Peek does not anticipate the invention of claims 1-4 and 19-22. Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of claims 1-4 and 19-22 be withdrawn.

If the Examiner elects to maintain the present rejection, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner indicate with specificity (e.g. column and line) what in the teachings of Peek is being equated with determining an address for a burst write of a command and arguments of the command based upon an argument count of the command and in response to performing the burst write, writing the arguments and the command starting from the address determined based upon the argument count.

Claims 5-6

Claims 5-6 include claim 1 as a base claim. Accordingly, claims 5-6 are allowable for at least the reasons stated above in regard to claim 1. Claims 5-6 further require performing a burst read of the status and any outputs of the command. The Office Action appears to rely on column 3, lines 37-39 of Peek for a teaching of claims 5-6. However, the identified portion of Peek appears to be referring to the ability of an Intel i960 processor to *write* a descriptor to memory using one transfer instruction. The identified section appears to be silent regarding *a burst read*. The DMA controller 400 appears to do the reading of the descriptors in Peek. However, as indicated at column 5, lines 3-4, Peek teaches that the DMA controller 400 reads words one at a time and therefore does not perform *a bust read* as required by claims 5-6. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 5-6 be withdrawn.

If the Examiner elects to maintain the present rejection, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner indicate with specificity (e.g. column and line) what in the teachings of Peek is being equated with performing a burst read of status and any

outputs of the command (claim 5) and reading the status prior to reading the any

outputs. Applicant also respectfully requests that any such identification indicate what is

being equated with the **status** and the **outputs** of claims 5-6.

Claims 8-12

Claims 8-12, as amended, require receiving a plurality of arguments and a

command during a burst write **to a device to execute the command**. The Office

Action appears to rely on Peek's description of transferring of a descriptor to memory

404 for a teaching of a burst write. However, Peek discloses a CPU 402 transferring a

descriptor to a memory 404, a DMA controller 400 later reading the descriptor from the

memory 404, and the DMA controller 400 transferring data per the read descriptor.

Claim 8-12 however requires the burst write to be to the same device that executes the

command. Peek appears to disclose performing a burst write of the descriptor to a

memory and then executing the transfer defined by the descriptor with a device (e.g.

DMA controller) that differs from the device (e.g. memory) to which the burst write of the

descriptor was directed. Accordingly, Peek does not appear to arrive at the invention of

claims 8-12. Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of claims 8-12 be withdrawn.

Conclusion

The foregoing is submitted as a full and complete response to the Office Action.

Applicant submits that all remaining claims are in condition for allowance.

Reconsideration is requested, and allowance of all remaining claims is earnestly

solicited.

Should it be determined that an additional fee is due under 37 CFR §§1.16 or

1.17, or any excess fee has been received, please charge that fee or credit the amount

of overcharge to deposit account #02-2666. If the Examiner believes that there are any

informalities which can be corrected by an Examiner's amendment, a telephone call to

the undersigned at (503) 439-8778 is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory D. Caldwell
Reg. No. 39,926

Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP
1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(408) 720-8300